



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/826,705	04/05/2001	Jack A. Alford JR.	AUS9-2000-0934-US1	3970

7590

08/06/2004

Edmond A. DeFrank
20145 Via Medici
Northridge, CA 91326

EXAMINER

MILLER, BRANDON J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2683

DATE MAILED: 08/06/2004

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/826,705

Applicant(s)

ALFORD ET AL.

Examiner

Brandon J Miller

Art Unit

2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Notice of References Cited

Application/Control No.

09/826,705

Applicant(s)/Patent Under
Reexamination
ALFORD ET AL.

Examiner

Brandon J Miller

Art Unit

2683

Page 1 of 1

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
	A	US-6,584,466 ✓	06-2003	Serbinis	707/10
	B	US-6,505,215 ✓	01-2003	Kruglikov	707/201
	C	US-6,611,849 ✓	08-2003	Raff	707/203
	D	US-			
	E	US-			
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	H	US-			
	I	US-			
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	
	V	
	W	
	X	

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 9-15, and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raff in view of Kruglikov.

Regarding claim 1 Raff teaches a method for configuring a managed computer system with an electronic mobile handheld device (see col. 7, lines 16-23 & 35-38 and FIGURE 1). Raff teaches transferring a configuration profile to an electronic mobile handheld device configuring the managed computer system by connecting the electronic mobile handheld device to the managed computer system and transferring the configuration profile (see col. 5, lines 1-20, col. 7, lines 16-23 & 35-38 and FIGURE 1). Raff does not specifically teach creating at least one configuration profile associated with the managed computer system with a user interface on a first computer. Kruglikov teaches creating at least one configuration profile associated with a managed computer system with a user interface on a first computer (see col. 4, lines 25-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include creating at least one configuration profile associated with the managed computer system with a user interface on a first computer because this would allow for increased flexibility when manipulating a user database.

Art Unit: 2683

Regarding claim 2 Raff teaches storing a configuration profile in a file format readable by the electronic mobile handheld device (see col. 7, lines 24-29 and col. 8, lines 17-20).

Regarding claim 3 Raff teaches a file format that is a database file format (see col. 7, lines 20-25).

Regarding claim 4 Raff teaches an electronic mobile handheld device that is a personal digital assistant (see col. 7, lines 28-31).

Regarding claim 5 Raff teaches using a computer-to-electronic mobile handheld device synchronization to transfer the configuration profile to the electronic mobile handheld device (see col. 7, lines 16-23 & 35-38 and FIGURE 1).

Regarding claim 6 Raff teaches a computer-to-electronic mobile handheld device synchronization that is a wireless connection (see col. 5, lines 20-23).

Regarding claim 7 Kruglikov teaches a user interface that allows a user to perform at least one of error checking or electronic help assistance (see col. 4, lines 25-44).

Regarding claim 9 Raff teaches a profile that includes unique addresses and hostnames for a computer system (see col. 7, lines 24-28).

Regarding claim 10 Raff teaches a method for configuring a managed computer system with an electronic mobile handheld device (see col. 7, lines 16-23 & 35-38 and FIGURE 1). Raff does not specifically teach creating at least one configuration profile associated with the managed computer system with a user interface on a first computer, or an electronic mobile handheld device that receives the configuration profile from the user interface, and interconnects with the managed computer system for configuring the managed computer system with the configuration profile. Kruglikov teaches creating at least one configuration profile associated

Art Unit: 2683

with a managed computer system with a user interface on a first computer (see col. 4, lines 25-44). Kruglikov teaches an electronic mobile handheld device that receives the configuration profile from the user interface, and interconnects with the managed computer system for configuring the managed computer system with the configuration profile (see col. 2, lines 29-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include creating at least one configuration profile associated with the managed computer system with a user interface on a first computer, and an electronic mobile handheld device that receives the configuration profile from the user interface, and interconnects with the managed computer system for configuring the managed computer system with the configuration profile because this would allow for increased flexibility when manipulating a user database.

Regarding claim 11 Raff teaches a device as recited in claim 4 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 12 Raff teaches an electronic mobile handheld device that is a cellular telephone (see col. 7, lines 28-31).

Regarding claim 13 Raff teaches a device as recited in claim 5 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 14 Raff teaches a device as recited in claim 6 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 15 Kruglikov teaches a device as recited in claim 7 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Art Unit: 2683

Regarding claim 17 Raff teaches a device as recited in claim 9 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 18 Raff teaches a method for configuring a managed computer system with an electronic mobile handheld device (see col. 7, lines 16-23 & 35-38 and FIGURE 1). Raff teaches transferring a configuration profile to an electronic mobile handheld device configuring the managed computer system by connecting the electronic mobile handheld device to the managed computer system and transferring the configuration profile (see col. 5, lines 1-20, col. 7, lines 16-23 & 35-38 and FIGURE 1). Raff does not specifically teach creating at least one configuration profile associated with the managed computer system with a user interface on a first computer. Kruglikov teaches creating at least one configuration profile associated with a managed computer system with a user interface on a first computer (see col. 4, lines 25-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include creating at least one configuration profile associated with the managed computer system with a user interface on a first computer because this would allow for increased flexibility when manipulating a user database.

Regarding claim 19 Raff teaches a device as recited in claim 4 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 20 Kruglikov teaches a device as recited in claim 7 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Claims 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raff in view of Kruglikov and Serbinis.

Art Unit: 2683

Regarding claim 8 Raff and Kruglikov teach a device as recited in claim 1 except for a managed computer system that includes multiple server computers as rack-mounted systems. Raff does teach a managed computer system that includes multiple computers (see col. 5, lines 1-7 and FIGURE 1). Serbinis teaches a managed computer system that includes multiple server computers (see col. 4, lines 56-60 and col. 6, lines 8-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include a managed computer system that includes multiple server computers as rack-mounted systems because this would allow for synchronization of multiple computers.

Regarding claim 16 Raff, Kruglikov, and Serbinis teach a device as recited in claim 8 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Shin U.S. Patent 6,006,109 discloses a wireless data communication system using a microphone/headphone jack of a portable phone.

Coglitore U.S. Patent 6,496,366 discloses a high density computer equipment storage system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon J Miller whose telephone number is 703-305-4222. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

Art Unit: 2683

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on 703-308-5318. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600